NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Document 1

Filed 03/06/2008

Page 1 of 28

Case 3:08-cv-00428_JAH-NLS

- 3
- 4
- 5 6
- 7
- 8 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- 28 U.S.C. §1331 provides that "district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States."
- 28 U.S.C. §1441(a) provides that "any civil action brought in the State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or the defendants, to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending."
- 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b) provides that "[a]ny civil action of which the district courts have original jurisdiction founded on the claim or right arising under the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States shall be removable without regard to the citizenship or residence of the parties."
- 28 U.S.C. § 1441(c)provides that "[w]henever a separate and 5. independent claim or cause of action with the jurisdiction conferred by section 1331 of this title is joined with one or more otherwise non-removable claims or causes of action, the entire case may be removed and the district court may determine all issues therein."
- This action is a civil action over which this Court has 6. original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and is one which may be removed to this Court pursuant to the provisions of 28 United States Code section 1441(b) in that it states a claim expressly under federal law. Specifically, plaintiffs allege violations of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 2310 et seq.
- Any remaining claims or causes of action in the complaint 7. that are otherwise nonremovable are joined with separate and

independent claims or causes of action within the jurisdiction conferred by 28 U.S.C. §1331, and the entire case is therefore removable under 28 U.S.C. §1441(c).

- On or about February 5, 2008, an action was filed in the San Diego Superior Court, North County Division, entitled John Rinaldi v. Porsche Cars North America, Inc., Case No. 37-2008-00051009-CU-BC-NC. A copy of the complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".
- Defendant PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC., was served with 9. a copy of the Summons and Complaint from the state court action on February 7, 2008.
- 10. Defendant PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC. attaches copies of all state court pleadings, process and orders which have been served as follows:
 - Complaint for Damages (Exhibit "A") a.
- b. Defendant PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC.'s Answer to Complaint (Exhibit "B").
- This Notice of Removal is timely because it is brought within thirty (30) days of the service of plaintiff's Complaint on any defendant.
- A Notice of filing of this Notice of Removal will be filed with the San Diego County Superior Court of the State of California, and served upon plaintiff.

111 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 111

111 26

27 111

Case 3:08-cv-00428-<u>JA</u>H-NLS Document 1 Filed 03/<u>06</u>/2008 Page 4 of 28

WHEREAS, defendant PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC. hereby removes to this court the Superior Court, County of San Diego case entitled John Rinaldi v. Porsche Cars North America, Inc., Case No. 37-2008-00051009-CU-BC-NC. Dated: March 6, 2008 GATES, O'DOHERTY, GONTER & GUY, LLP Attorneys for Defendant PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC. ·16

RECEIVED

CT CORPORATION

FEB 1 1 2008

A Wolterskiuwer Company

PCNA LEGAL DEPT.

Service of Process Transmittal

02/07/2008

CT Log Number 513064973

TO:

Patricia R Britton, General Counsel Porsche Cars North America, Inc. 980 Hammond Drive, Suite 1000 Atlanta, GA 30328

RE:

Process Served In California

FÖR:

Porsche Cars North America, Inc. (Domestic State: DE)

ENCLOSED ARE COPIES OF LEGAL PROCESS RECEIVED BY THE STATUTORY AGENT OF THE ABOVE COMPANY AS FOLLOWS:

TITLE OF ACTION:

John Rinaldi, etc., Pltf. vs. Porsche Cars North America, Inc., etc., et al., Dfts.

DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:

Summons, Cover Sheet, Notice(s), Stipulation Form, Complaint

COURT/AGENCY:

Superior Court, County of San Diego, CA Case # 3720080051009

NATURE OF ACTION:

Product Liability Litigation - Breach of Warranty - Failure to repair engine defects -

2003 Porsche

ON WHOM PROCESS WAS SERVED!

C T Corporation System, Los Angeles, CA

DATE AND HOUR OF SERVICE:

By Process Server on 02/07/2008 at 15:20

APPEARANCE OR ANSWER DUE:

Within 30 days after service

ATTORNEY(S) / SENDER(S):

Jonathan D. McCue

Lemon Law Advocates

31938 Highway 79 South, Suite A-328 Temecula, CA 92592 951-553-4986

ACTION ITEMS:

SOP Papers with Transmittal, via Fed Ex 2 Day , 798370096867 Email Notification, Patricia R Britton pbritton@porschecars.com

SIGNED: PER: ADDRESS:

C T Corporation System Nancy Flores 818 West Seventh Street

TELEPHONE

Los Angeles, CA 90017 213-337-4615

Page 1 of 1/BF

Information displayed on this transmittal is for CT Corporation's record keeping purposes only and is provided to the recipient for quick reference. This information does not constitute a legal opinion as to the nature of action, the amount of damages, the answer date, or any information contained in the documents themselves. Recipient is responsible for interpreting said documents and for taking appropriate action. Signatures on certified mail receipts confirm receipt of package only, not contents.

SUM-100

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:

(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):
Porsche Cars North America, Inc., a corporation; and

DOES 1 through 5

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE) NORTH COUNTY D 2008 FEB -5 AM 10: 59 CLERK-UPFEAM SAM DIEGO COL

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): John Rinaldi, an individual

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court end have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the Celifornia Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.opurtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee walver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court,

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away, if you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Holp Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or courtly bar association.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para plasentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una liamada telejónica no ló protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfnelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pide al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiampo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podré quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce e un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, os posible que cumple con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos da un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California; (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/seifhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): Superior Court of California

CASE NUMBER 37:2008-00051009-CU-BC-NC

| North County Division 325 South Melrose Vista, CA 92081 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| The name, address, and telephone number of (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfo Jonathan D. McCue, Esq. (128 Lemon Law Advocates | ono del abogado del demandante, o | del demandante que no tiene | a abogado, es); 951-302-5850 |
| 31938 Highway 79 South, Suit | te A-328 | and the state of t | and the same of th |
| Temecula, CA 92592 DATE: (Fecha) FEB - 5 2008 | Clerk, by(Secretario) | TONI OZENE/ | ALIGH Deputy (Adjunto) |
| (For proof of service of this summons, use Pro- | oof of Service of Summons (form PO | S-010).) | (/sujuito) |
| (Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use | | | |
| ISEAU 1 1 7 ac s | THE PERSON SERVED: You are se an individual defendant. | | |
| 2 as t | he person sued under the fictitious n | ame of (speqify): | • |
| | Horsche (| JUB NOTH AN | nerica . Inc. o |
| 3, \(\sigma\) on | he person sued under the fictitious n POCCHE (behalf of (specify): CONPON | ation | |
| under: [| CCP 416.10 (corporation) | CCP 416.60 | |
| | CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation | | (conservatee) |
| | CCP 416.40 (association or part | inership) [] CGP 416.90 | (authorized person) |

by personal delivery on (date):

Page 1 of 1

| | • | NORTH CHANGE |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Lemon Law Advocates Jonathan D. McCue (128896) | 2008 FEB -5 AN :: 00 |
| 2 | Stephen P. Polapink (177489) | AM: 00 |
| 3 | 31938 Highway 79 South, Suite A-328 Temecula, CA 92592 | |
| 4 | (T) 951-553-4986 | A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR |
| 5 | (F) 951-302-5850 | |
| 6 | Attorneys for Plaintiff | · |
| 7 | | THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF | THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA |
| 9 | FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN | DIEGO, NORTH COUNTY DIVISION |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | John Rinaldi, | CASE NO |
| 12 | an individual, | CASE NO 37-2008-00051009-CU-BC-NC |
| 13 | Plaintiff, | COMPLAINT FOR RESTITUTION, DAMAGES AND CIVIL PENALTY |
| 14 | v. | |
| 15 | Porsche Cars North America, Inc., | |
| 16 | a corporation; and DOES 1 through 5, inclusive. | |
| 17 | Defendants | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | 1. Plaintiff John Rinaldi ("p | plaintiff") brings this action on his own behalf, |
| 23 | and based upon information and belief, a | gainst defendants Porsche Curs North America, |
| | Inc., a corporation and DOES 1 through | 5, inclusive ("defendants"). |
| | Complaint for Restitution | Damages and Chill Panaity |
| 2425 | Complaint for Restitution, | Damages and Civil Penalty |

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

: 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

- 2. On, or about, April 26, 2007, Plaintiff John Rinaldi purchased a 2003 Porsche, vehicle identification number WP 0 A A 2 9 9 6 3 S 6 2 3 8 1 1, ("vehicle" or the "Porsche"), from Lexus Kearny Mesa.
- The vehicle was purchased within, and the nonconformities began during, 3. the manufacturer's, defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc.'s, factory warranty period.
- Plaintiff John Rinaldi uses his vehicle primarily for personal, family, and 4. household purposes. Soon after purchase, Plaintiff experienced continuing nonconformities with the vehicle, including, but not limited to, the following: difficulty getting into second gear; popping out of gear; defective first and second gear synchronizer; defective dog teeth; static noise from radio; abnormal clunking/clacking noise from rear of vehicle; intermediate shaft bearing cage failure; intermediate shaft bearing missing bearings; defective flange bearing; vehicle not starting; engine clunking when not starting; engine consuming too much oil; vehicle not starting; and a broken trip switch.
- Despite confirmation of the nonconformities and repeated repair attempts, 5. defendants have been unable to correct the nonconformities. These nonconformities substantially impair the use, value and/or safety of the vehicle.
- 6. Plaintiff and his attorneys attempted in good faith to resolve this matter directly with defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc. until Porsche Cars North America, Inc. without explanation, stopped responding to such efforts. In fact, plaintiff had been offered \$3,000.00 to settle this claim before seeking representation. Defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc. never reiterated this offer nor explained its withdrawal.

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | |
| 23 | |

25

| \mathbf{r} | • | 7 | - | Æ | • |
|--------------|---|---|-----|------|---|
| Р | Δ | R | - 1 | 1 14 | • |
| | | | | | |

- Plaintiff John Rinaldi is an individual residing in the County of San Diego, 7. State of California.
- Defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc. is a corporation registered 8. and transacting business in the County of San Diego, State of California.
- The true names and capacities of defendants sued herein under Code of 9. Civil Procedure §474 as DOES 1 through 5, inclusive, are presently unknown to Plaintiff who will seek to amend this complaint to include these DOE defendants when they are identified.
- At all times mentioned in the complaint, each of the defendants was an 10. agent of each and every other defendant. In doing the things alleged in the complaint, each defendant was acting within the course and scope of their agency and was acting with the consent, permission and authorization of each of the other defendants.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the Constitution of the State of California, Article VI, § 10, as this case is not a cause given by statute to other trial courts.
- 12. This Court has jurisdiction over each defendant pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §410.10 by virtue of their extensive business dealings and transactions within this state. Each defendant is either a corporation or association organized under the laws of the State of California, a foreign corporation or association authorized to do business in

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| б | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | ĺ |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| California, or does sufficient business, has sufficient minimum contacts with or avails |
|---|
| itself of the California market through the manufacturing, production, promotion, sale, |
| marketing and distribution of product in California. Exercise of jurisdiction by California |
| courts is permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. |

13. Venue is proper in this county pursuant to Title 29 of the United States Code, Chapter 18, §1132 and Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395 and 395.5 as this is a court of competent jurisdiction, and defendants conduct business in this county.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Complaint for violation of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, Civil Code §§1790 et seq. as against all defendants)

- Plaintiff John Rinaldi incorporates all prior allegations. 14.
- The vehicle is a consumer good as defined under the Song-Beverly 15. Consumer Warranty Act.
- Plaintiff is a "purchaser" of consumer goods as defined under the Song-16. Beverly Consumer Warranty Act.
- 17. Defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc. is a "manufacturer" and "distributor" as defined under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act.
- 18. The serious nonconformities have manifested themselves within the applicable express warranty period. The nonconformities substantially impair the use, value and/or safety of the vehicle.

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | 19. The sale of the vehicle to plaintiff was also accompanied by an implied |
| 3 | warranty that the vehicle was merchantable. The sale of the vehicle to plaintiff was also |
| 4 | accompanied by defendants' implied warranty of fitness. |
| 5 | 20. Plaintiff brought the vehicle into authorized repair facilities for repairs on |
| 6 | numerous occasions in attempts to have the existing warranties satisfied. |
| 7 | 21. Defendants have not repaired the nonconformities after a reasonable |
| 8 | number of attempts and, as such, have failed to comply with all applicable warranty |
| 9 | requirements. |
| 10 | 22. Despite their breach of the express and implied warranties, defendants |
| 11 | have refused plaintiff's demand for a refund or replacement. |
| 12 | 23. By failure of defendants to remedy the defects as alleged above, or to issue |
| 13 | a refund or replacement, defendants are in breach of their obligations under the Song- |
| 14 | Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. |
| 15 | 24. As a result of defendants' violation of the Song-Beverly Consumer |
| 16 | Warranty Act, plaintiff is entitled to relief as set forth in the prayer of this complaint. |
| 17 | SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION |
| 18 | (Complaint for violation of the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act, |
| 19 | 15 U.S.C. §§2031 et seq. as against all defendants) |
| 20 | 25. Plaintiff John Rinaldi incorporates all prior allegations. |
| 21 | 26. The vehicle is a consumer product as defined in the Magnuson Moss |
| 22 | Warranty Act. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| | 1 | |
|---|----|--|
| | 2 | |
| | 3 | |
| | 4 | |
| | 5 | |
| | 6 | |
| | | |
| | 7 | |
| • | 8 | |
| | 9 | |
| | 10 | |
| | 11 | |
| | 12 | |
| | 13 | |
| | 14 | |
| | 15 | |
| | 16 | |
| | 17 | |
| | 18 | |
| | 19 | |
| | 20 | |
| | 21 | |
| | 22 | |
| | 23 | |
| | 24 | |

| 27. | Plaintiffs is a "consumer" | as that term is defined in | the Magnuson Moss |
|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | |
| Warranty Act | • | | |

- Defendant Porsche Cars North America, Inc. is a "supplier" and 28. "warrantor" as those terms are defined under the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act.
- 29. Plaintiff's purchase of the vehicle created an implied warranty of merchantability.
- 30. Defendants have failed to provide a vehicle free from serious defects and nonconformities. They have also failed to adequately repair or replace the vehicle. These failures constitute a breach of the express and implied warranties covering the vehicle. As such, defendants have violated the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act.
- 31. Plaintiff John Rinaldi has performed in accordance with the provisions of the purchase contract, warranties and all applicable laws.
- 32. Plaintiff John Rinaldi has suffered damage, in an amount according to proof at trial, as a direct and proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendants.
- As a result of defendants' violation of the Magnuson Moss Warranty Act, 33. plaintiff is entitled to relief as set forth in the prayer of this complaint.

| 1 | | |
|----|-------------|---|
| 2 | | PRAYER FOR RELIEF |
| 3 | WHE | REFORE, Plaintiff John Rinaldi prays for judgment as follows: |
| 4 | 1. | For general, special and actual damages according to proof at trial; |
| 5 | 2. | For rescission of the purchase contract and restitution of all monies |
| 6 | expended; | |
| 7 | 3, | For incidental and consequential damages according to proof at trial; |
| 8 | 4. | For a civil penalty in an amount of two times plaintiff's actual damages; |
| 9 | 5. | For prejudgment interest at the legal rate; |
| 10 | 6. | For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and |
| 11 | 7. | For such other and further relief as this court deems just and proper. |
| 12 | To A CENTRO | February /, 2008 LEMON LAW ADVOCATES |
| 13 | DATED: | February /, 2008 LEMON LAW ADVOCATES Jonathan D. McCue (128896) |
| 14 | | Stephen P. Polapink (177489) |
| 15 | | 1-40 |
| 16 | | 100-5 |
| 17 | | Jonathan D. McCue |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | • |
| 24 | \$ | |

| . | | The state of the s |
|----------|---|--|
| 2 | GATES, O'DOHERTY, GONTER & GUY, 15373 Innovation Drive, Suite 170 San Diego, California 92128 Telephone: (858) 676-8600 | LLP (2010) |
| 3 | Facsimile: (858) 676-8601 | A so . |
| 4 | Attorney: DOUGLAS D. GUY, ESQ. (SBN 1178 dguy@gogglaw.com | 144) Grand Grand Grand |
| 5 | NADINE M. SAYEGH, ESQ. (SBN 25 n sayegh@gogglaw.com | |
| 6 | *************************************** | |
| 7 | Attorneys for Defendant PORSCHE (| CARS NORTH AMERICA, INC. |
| 8 | | |
| . 9 | IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF C | CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO |
| 10 | NORTH CO | UNTY DIVISION |
| 11 | JOHN RINALDI, an individual, | CASE NO. 37-2008-00051009-CU-BC-NC |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | |
| 13 | vs. | ANSWER TO COMPLAINT |
| 14 15 | PORSCHE CARS NORTH AMERICA,) INC., a corporation, and DOES 1) through 5, inclusive,) | Judge Robert P. Dahlquist Department N-29 |
| 16 |) | Action Filed: February 5, 2008 |
| 17 | Defendants.) | Accion filed: replacty 3, 2000 |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | |)) |
| 20 | | |
| 21 |) |)) |
| 22 | Defendant PORSCHE CARS | NORTH AMERICA, INC. ("Answering |
| 23 | Defendant") answers the Complain | t filed by JOHN RINALDI ("Plaintiff") |
| 24 | as follows: | |
| 24 25 | GENE | RAL DENIAL |
| 25 26 | 1. Inasmuch as the Complair | nt is not verified, and under the |
| 20 | | edure §431.30, Answering Defendant |
| 28 | | y each and every allegation in such |
| 28 | , · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| ļ | t | 1 |

. 7

2. Further answering such Complaint and the whole thereof, including each and every cause of action therein, Answering Defendant denies that Plaintiff has sustained, or will sustain, any damage or loss by reason of any act, omission, breach of contract, either express or implied or both, or any other conduct or absence thereof on the part of Answering Defendant or any agent, servant, or employee of Answering Defendant, and denies that Answering Defendant committed of any wrongful act or omission whatsoever.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Comparative Fault)

3. If Plaintiff sustained any damages as alleged in the complaint, that damage was proximately caused and contributed to by Plaintiff in failing to conduct himself in a manner ordinarily expected of reasonably prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs and business. The contributory negligence and fault of Plaintiff diminishes any recovery herein.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Contributory Negligence of Third Parties)

4. If the Plaintiff sustained any damages as alleged in the complaint, that damage was proximately caused and contributed to by persons and/or parties other than Answering Defendant in failing to conduct themselves in a manner ordinarily expected of reasonably prudent persons in the conduct of their affairs and business.

Contributory negligence and fault of persons and/or parties other than Answering Defendant diminishes any recovery from this Answering Defendant.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

- 12
- 13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

///

111

28

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure To State A Cause Of Action)

5. Plaintiff's complaint, and each cause of action and count thereof, fails to state sufficient facts to constitute a cause of action against the Answering Defendant.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Disclaimer of Warranties/Damages)

6. Plaintiff's causes of action for breach of express and implied warranties and incidental and consequential damages are barred or limited by the express disclaimers and limitations of liability contained in the alleged express warranties or other agreements made by Answering Defendant. These disclaimers bar or limit Plaintiff's recovery herein.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Statute of Limitations)

7. Any cause of action alleged in the complaint is barred by the statute of limitations, whether contained in Code of Civil Procedure, sections 337, 338, 339, 340, 343, Commercial Code section 2725, Answering Defendant's warranty, Civil Code section 1783, or otherwise.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate Damages)

8. If Plaintiff sustained any damage as alleged in the complaint, that damage was proximately caused and contributed to by Plaintiff in failing to mitigate damages. Plaintiff's failure to mitigate damages diminishes any recovery herein.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Estoppel)

9. Answering Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Plaintiff has engaged in conduct and activity sufficient to estop them from asserting all or any part of any claim set forth in their complaint.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unclean Hands)

10. Answering Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the claims and relief sought by Plaintiff are barred by reason of the doctrine of unclean hands.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Waiver)

11. Answering Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Plaintiff has engaged in conduct and activities sufficient to constitute a waiver of any alleged breach of contract, breach of warranty, negligence or any other conduct as set forth in the complaint.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Laches)

12. Answering Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Plaintiff waited an unreasonable period of time to complain of the alleged acts or omissions at issue in the complaint so as to prejudice this Answering Defendant. Plaintiff is therefore guilty of laches and barred from recovery.

26 | ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27 | ///

28 1///

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure of Performance)

13. Answering Defendant is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that any failure to perform the obligations as described in the complaint resulted from Plaintiff's failure to perform as required by the contract and/or warranty. Performance on Plaintiff's part of their obligations was a condition precedent to the performance of Answering Defendant's obligations.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Alteration of Product)

14. The vehicle was not defective or in an unmerchantable condition at any time when it left the possession, custody and control of these Answering Defendant. Any damage to the subject vehicle was caused and created by changes and alterations made to the vehicle, subsequent to the time of the vehicle's manufacture and/or sale, by persons other than Answering Defendant or any of its agents, servants, or employees, thereby barring Plaintiff's recovery herein.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State Facts Sufficient for Recovery of a Civil Penalty)

15. The complaint fails to state sufficient facts to warrant the imposition of a civil penalty.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Consent)

16. The repair process to Plaintiff's vehicle was appropriate and proper and is believed to have been done with the Plaintiff's consent.

27 1///

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28 | ///

4

3

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Abuse or Failure to Maintain)

The Plaintiff is barred from recovery by virtue of Civil Code section 1794.3, and other law, since the claimed defects or nonconformities were caused by the unauthorized or unreasonable use of the vehicle following sale.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Waiver of Right to Restitution/Rescission-Type Damages)

18. Plaintiff has waived his right to seek restitution or rescission-type damages against Answering Defendant as a matter of law, or, as an alternative, Answering Defendant is entitled to an equitable setoff for use of the vehicle.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Privity)

There is no contractual vertical privity between the Plaintiff and Answering Defendant therefore barring any claim for breach of implied warranty.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Revocation)

Plaintiff is not entitled to revocation/rescission type damages because there is no vertical privity between Plaintiff and Answering Defendant.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[Failure to Properly Revoke Acceptance]

The Plaintiff failed to properly revoke acceptance by either failing to notify within a reasonable amount of time and/or before substantially altering or changing the product.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[Failure to Provide Notice or Give Opportunity to Cure]

22. The Plaintiff's Complaint fails as a matter of law due to their failure to provide notice and give Answering Defendant an opportunity to cure.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[Business Use of the Motor home]

23. The Plaintiff's Complaint fails as a matter of law due to his use of the motor home for business purposes.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[Failure to Submit Claims to Dispute Resolution]

24. The Plaintiff failed to submit his claims to Answering Defendant's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program as set forth in Answering Defendant's warranty, and by law, thus precluding any claim pursuant to the Magnuson Moss warranty Act or a civil penalty pursuant to the Song-Beverly Warranty Act.

WHEREFORE, ANSWERING DEFENDANT prays as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiff take nothing by way of his complaint on file herein:
- 2. That judgment be entered in favor of defendant, including costs of suit; and

23 | ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24 | | / / /

25 | ///

26 | ///

27 | ///

28 | ///

Case 3:08-cv-00428-JAH-NLS Document 1 Filed 03/06/2008 Page 24 of 28

PROOF OF SERVICE - CCP \$1013a(3)

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 15373 Innovation Drive, Suite 170, San Diego, CA 92128.

On March 5, 2008, I served the foregoing document described as **ANSWER TO COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action in the following manner:

Jonathan D. McCue, Esq. Stephen P. Polapink, Esq. Lemon Law Advocates 31938 Highway 79 South, Suite A-328 Temecula, CA 92592 (951)553-4986, Fax (951)302-5850

Attorneys for Plaintiff
JOHN RINALDI

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

2

3

5

(X) **BY MAIL.** I am familiar with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and that the correspondence shall be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the same day in the ordinary course of business pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013a. I am aware that on a motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing affidavit.

16

()

()

()

BY FACSIMILE. In addition to service by mail as set forth above, a copy of said document(s) was also delivered by facsimile transmission to the addressee(s) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013(e).

17

19

BY PERSONAL SERVICE. I caused a true copy of said document(s) to be hand-delivered to the addressee(s) via a California registered process server pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1011. If required, said registered process server's original proof of personal service will be filed with the court immediately upon its receipt.

20

22

BY EXPRESS MAIL. I caused a true copy of said document(s) to be deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier providing overnight delivery pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013(c).

23

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 5, 2008, at San Diego, California.

2526

2728

JENNIFER LYNN SMITH

PROOF OF SERVICE - CCP §1013a(3)

I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 15373 Innovation Drive, Suite 170, San Diego, California 92128.

On March 6, 2008, I served the foregoing document described as NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b), and 1446 on the interested parties in this action as set forth on the attached service list in the following manner:

- (X) BY MAIL. I am familiar with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, and that the correspondence shall be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the same day in the ordinary course of business pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013a. I am aware that on a motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing affidavit.
- () **BY FACSIMILE.** In addition to service by mail as set forth above, a copy of said document(s) was also delivered by facsimile transmission to the addressee(s) pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013(e).
- () BY PERSONAL SERVICE. I caused a true copy of said document(s) to be hand-delivered to the addressee(s) via a California registered process server pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1011. If required, said registered process server's original proof of personal service will be filed with the court immediately upon its receipt.
- () BY EXPRESS MAIL. I caused a true copy of said document(s) to be deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier providing overnight delivery pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013(c).

I hereby certify that I am employed in the office of a member of the Bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 6, 2008, at San Diego, California.

JENNIFER LYNN SMITH

27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

148478 * * C O P Y * * March 06, 2008 15:32:04

Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAO #.: 08CV0428

Judge..: JOHN A HOUSTON

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: BC0038707

Total-> \$350.00

FROM: RINALDI V. PORSCHE CARS NA

| • • | | | | i sigo L | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| JS 44 (Rev. 11/04) | | CIVIL COVE | R SHEET | | s attack agrang to consider |
| the JS 44 civil cover sheet and the JS 45 civil cover sheet an | he information contained to all rules of court. This form the civil do not initiating the civil do | nerein neither replace , approved by the Jud cket sheet. (SEE INS | nor supplement the filing an icial Conference of the Unite TRUCTIONS ON THE REVIOUS ON THE REVIOUS PORSCHE CARS NO | ERSE OF THE FORM) | LED |
| | | | | CLERK. U.S. E SOUTHERN DISTR | ISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| San Diego, (c) Ambriney's (Firm Name, Address, GATES, O'DOHERTY, 15373 Innovation Suite 170 San Diego, CA 921 | S. PLAINTIFF CASES) Cown (-) and Telaphone Number) GONTER & GUY, Drive | LLP | NOTE: IN JAND CONDEMNA LÂND INVOLVED. Anomeye (M. Known) | LAINTIER CASES ONLY | CATION OF THE |
| 858-676-8600 II. BASIS OF JURISDICT | 10N (Place an "X" in One Box | Only) III. CIT | ZENSHIP OF PRINCI | PAL PARTIES (Plac | e an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff nd One Box for Defendant) |
| · | 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of in Item III) | (For Party) Citizen of T | Diversity Offices Only) PTF DEF his State | Incorporated or Principal of Business In This St Incorporated and Princip of Business In Anothe | PTF DEF S Place 4 4 ate al Place 5 5 |
| | Place an "X" in One Box C | only) | | | nmiletyki i kazatta esiki |
| 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotleble Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 132 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veterent's Benefits 150 Stockholders' Suite 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torte to Lend 245 Ton Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property | PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Aseault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 954 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Other Personal Injury | 510 Motion to Vecate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 536 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Ctvli Rights S55 Prison Condition | e10 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Law 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Occupational Sefety/Health 690 Other 710 Feir Lebor Standards Aca 720 Lebor/Mgmt. Reporting & Diaclosure Aci 740 Railway Lebor Aci 790 Other Labor Lingerion 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. | 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 a20 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 851 HIA (1395ff) 962 Black Lung (923) 883 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) | 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 430 Commerce 480 Departation 470 Racketeer Influenced an Compil Organizationa 480 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 993 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Juetles 950 Constitutionality of Stato Statutes |
| 1 Original X 2 Re | moved from 3 Rema ate Court Appell | nded from4 R ate Court R | einstated or 5 Transferr eopened Another dis (specify) | atrict Litigation | 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistra Judgment U.S.C. 2310 |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION | Brief description of cause: | Violation of | De not cite jurisdictional statut | | nly if demanded in complai |
| VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: | CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.R.C.P. 2 | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | DEMAND\$ 0.00 | JURY DEMAN | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE(S | | | | KET NUMBER | |
| DATE 3/6/08 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | A GNA | TURE OF ATTORNEY OF RE | Jaylo | MAG. JUDGE | |
| RECEIPT # 148478 | \$350 Ser 310 | 08 19 IFF | JUDGE | MAG. JUUGE _ | |